

## ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Clinical Pediatrics

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 24378

**Title:** Significant variations in nutritional supplementation amongst neonates in the United Kingdom

**Reviewer's code:** 00646241

**Reviewer's country:** Germany

**Science editor:** Shui Qiu

**Date sent for review:** 2016-01-20 17:41

**Date reviewed:** 2016-03-19 18:36

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		BPG Search:	
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	

## COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

In the paper, "SIGNIFICANT VARIATIONS IN NUTRITIONAL SUPPLEMENTATION AMONGST NEONATES IN THE UK", the authors Morris Gordon et al. present a useful and interesting study regarding nutritional supplementation in preterm babies in the UK. Since these infants are well known to have a particular need in several substances supplementing breast milk or formula food, like vitamins and certain minerals, recommendations for this supplementation are given in guidelines by the European society ESPGHAN. However, as the authors state, the actual practice in the hospitals is not so well-defined; therefore, it is a very useful project to collect information concerning the supplementation regimens currently performed, and to compare the standard recommendations. The paper is a systematic telephone-based interview analysis of the current supplementation practice, showing great inconstancy; with apparent over- and underdosage in several hospitals. This is an important work, however, several aspects should be improved, in particular since the work is addressed to international readers. First, details regarding the ESPGHAN recommendations are not given, and there is no discussion whether these recommendations which



## BAISHIDENG PUBLISHING GROUP INC

8226 Regency Drive, Pleasanton, CA 94588, USA

Telephone: +1-925-223-8242

Fax: +1-925-223-8243

E-mail: [bpgoffice@wjgnet.com](mailto:bpgoffice@wjgnet.com)

<http://www.wjgnet.com>

---

date from 2010 (JPGN 2010;50:85–91) are still valid. They are just quoted in the table. Further, in the table, a Great Ormond Street Guidance is quoted which is not further explained at all. It gives completely different recommendations, however focuses on infants (also preterms?) at 3 months of age. Are there other recommendations? In the paper, brand and generic names of supplements and formulas are used without specification. Brand names should be marked as such, and the content of the commercially available supplements should be given. The authors state that about 50% of the hospitals answered. They should give a summary how many of the responders and non-responders were smaller or larger hospitals, and what level of care they were giving. Minor points abstract and results: instead of "...with only 7% using a weight targets to..." better use another type of phrase, this one does not seem correct to me results and discussion : the word "Iron" often is incorrectly written with capital letter)

## ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Clinical Pediatrics

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 24378

**Title:** Significant variations in nutritional supplementation amongst neonates in the United Kingdom

**Reviewer's code:** 00503182

**Reviewer's country:** Egypt

**Science editor:** Shui Qiu

**Date sent for review:** 2016-01-20 17:41

**Date reviewed:** 2016-03-24 20:02

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		BPG Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	

## COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

None

## ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Clinical Pediatrics

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 24378

**Title:** Significant variations in nutritional supplementation amongst neonates in the United Kingdom

**Reviewer's code:** 03433215

**Reviewer's country:** China

**Science editor:** Shui Qiu

**Date sent for review:** 2016-01-20 17:41

**Date reviewed:** 2016-02-02 14:42

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	BPG Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	

## COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

No